

Stephanie Kost

From: Bonnie Lelak [blelak@yahoo.com]
Sent: Friday, October 15, 2004 1:38 PM
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Subject: Stop "Pay Per Channel" Plans

Bonnie Lelak
247 Arbor Hill Rd
Canton, GA 30115

October 15, 2004

Jonathan S Adelstein

,

Dear Jonathan Adelstein:

I have been informed that there are discussions under way to change cable service to a "pay per channel" system.

I am writing to urge you, in the strongest possible way, to oppose this move.

Pay per channel will severely diminish the variety of channel options that I currently have through cable, and will not save me any money. In fact, with the additional fees and equipment needs, it could end up costing me more.

While I understand the good intentions that are behind this, in order to give the consumer more control over what they view, this move will not only reduce the viewing options, but it will also destroy smaller channels and religious broadcasters.

A better way to ensure quality content on television is to enforce decency standards through fines and other regulatory actions.

Sincerely,

Bonnie Lelak

Stephanie Kost

From: Bonnie Lelak [blalak@yahoo.com]
Sent: Friday, October 15, 2004 1:37 PM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Stop "Pay Per Channel" Plans

Bonnie Lelak
247 Arbor Hill Rd
Canton, GA 30115

October 15, 2004

Kevin J Martin
,

Dear Kevin Martin:

I have been informed that there are discussions under way to change cable service to a "pay per channel" system.

I am writing to urge you, in the strongest possible way, to oppose this move.

Pay per channel will severely diminish the variety of channel options that I currently have through cable, and will not save me any money. In fact, with the additional fees and equipment needs, it could end up costing me more.

While I understand the good intentions that are behind this, in order to give the consumer more control over what they view, this move will not only reduce the viewing options, but it will also destroy smaller channels and religious broadcasters.

A better way to ensure quality content on television is to enforce decency standards through fines and other regulatory actions.

Sincerely,

Bonnie Lelak

Stephanie Kost

From: Bonnie Lelak [blalak@yahoo.com]
Sent: Friday, October 15, 2004 1:37 PM
To: Michael Powell
Subject: Stop "Pay Per Channel" Plans

Bonnie Lelak
247 Arbor Hill Rd
Canton, GA 30115

October 15, 2004

Michael K Powell

Dear Michael Powell:

I have been informed that there are discussions under way to change cable service to a "pay per channel" system.

I am writing to urge you, in the strongest possible way, to oppose this move.

Pay per channel will severely diminish the variety of channel options that I currently have through cable, and will not save me any money. In fact, with the additional fees and equipment needs, it could end up costing me more.

While I understand the good intentions that are behind this, in order to give the consumer more control over what they view, this move will not only reduce the viewing options, but it will also destroy smaller channels and religious broadcasters.

A better way to ensure quality content on television is to enforce decency standards through fines and other regulatory actions.

Sincerely,

Bonnie Lelak

Stephanie Kost

From: Ben Ferrell [ben@bmcadv.com]
Sent: Wednesday, October 13, 2004 3:45 PM
To: Michael Powell
Subject: Do Not Destroy Cable Variety

Ben Ferrell
President
BMC Advertising
2419 E. Skelly Drive
Tulsa, OK 74105

October 13, 2004

Michael K Powell
,

Dear Michael Powell:

I have been informed that there are discussions under way to change cable service to a "pay per channel" system.

I am writing to urge you, in the strongest possible way, to oppose this move.

Pay per channel will severely diminish the variety of channel options that I currently have through cable, and will not save me any money. In fact, with the additional fees and equipment needs, it could end up costing me more.

While I understand the good intentions that are behind this, in order to give the consumer more control over what they view, this move will not only reduce the viewing options, but it will also destroy smaller channels and religious broadcasters.

A better way to ensure quality content on television is to enforce decency standards through fines and other regulatory actions.

Sincerely,

Ben Ferrell
918-743-4600
President
BMC Advertising

Stephanie Kost

From: Ben Ferrell [ben@bmcadv.com]
Sent: Wednesday, October 13, 2004 3:45 PM
To: Michael Copps
Subject: Do Not Destroy Cable Variety

Ben Ferrell
President
BMC Advertising
2419 E. Skelly Drive
Tulsa, OK 74105

October 13, 2004

Michael J Copps

Dear Michael Copps:

I have been informed that there are discussions under way to change cable service to a "pay per channel" system.

I am writing to urge you, in the strongest possible way, to oppose this move.

Pay per channel will severely diminish the variety of channel options that I currently have through cable, and will not save me any money. In fact, with the additional fees and equipment needs, it could end up costing me more.

While I understand the good intentions that are behind this, in order to give the consumer more control over what they view, this move will not only reduce the viewing options, but it will also destroy smaller channels and religious broadcasters.

A better way to ensure quality content on television is to enforce decency standards through fines and other regulatory actions.

Sincerely,

Ben Ferrell
918-743-4600
President
BMC Advertising

Stephanie Kost

From: Ben Ferrell [ben@bmcadv.com]
Sent: Wednesday, October 13, 2004 3:45 PM
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Subject: Do Not Destroy Cable Variety

Ben Ferrell
President
BMC Advertising
2419 E. Skelly Drive
Tulsa, OK 74105

October 13, 2004

Jonathan S Adelstein

Dear Jonathan Adelstein:

I have been informed that there are discussions under way to change cable service to a "pay per channel" system.

I am writing to urge you, in the strongest possible way, to oppose this move.

Pay per channel will severely diminish the variety of channel options that I currently have through cable, and will not save me any money. In fact, with the additional fees and equipment needs, it could end up costing me more.

While I understand the good intentions that are behind this, in order to give the consumer more control over what they view, this move will not only reduce the viewing options, but it will also destroy smaller channels and religious broadcasters.

A better way to ensure quality content on television is to enforce decency standards through fines and other regulatory actions.

Sincerely,

Ben Ferrell
918-743-4600
President
BMC Advertising

Stephanie Kost

From: Ben Ferrell [ben@bmcadv.com]
Sent: Wednesday, October 13, 2004 3:45 PM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Do Not Destroy Cable Variety

Ben Ferrell
President
BMC Advertising
2419 E. Skelly Drive
Tulsa, OK 74105

October 13, 2004

Kevin J Martin
,

Dear Kevin Martin:

I have been informed that there are discussions under way to change cable service to a "pay per channel" system.

I am writing to urge you, in the strongest possible way, to oppose this move.

Pay per channel will severely diminish the variety of channel options that I currently have through cable, and will not save me any money. In fact, with the additional fees and equipment needs, it could end up costing me more.

While I understand the good intentions that are behind this, in order to give the consumer more control over what they view, this move will not only reduce the viewing options, but it will also destroy smaller channels and religious broadcasters.

A better way to ensure quality content on television is to enforce decency standards through fines and other regulatory actions.

Sincerely,

Ben Ferrell
918-743-4600
President
BMC Advertising

Stephanie Kost

From: Becky Addington [bjbrooks03@earthlink.net]
Sent: Wednesday, October 13, 2004 5:29 PM
To: Michael Powell
Subject: Do Not Destroy Cable Variety

Becky Addington
511 Glyn Ellen Dr.
Union City, Indiana 47390

October 13, 2004

Michael K Powell
,

Dear Michael Powell:

I have been informed that there are discussions under way to change cable service to a "pay per channel" system.

I am writing to urge you, in the strongest possible way, to oppose this move.

Pay per channel will severely diminish the variety of channel options that I currently have through cable, and will not save me any money. In fact, with the additional fees and equipment needs, it could end up costing me more.

While I understand the good intentions that are behind this, in order to give the consumer more control over what they view, this move will not only reduce the viewing options, but it will also destroy smaller channels and religious broadcasters.

A better way to ensure quality content on television is to enforce decency standards through fines and other regulatory actions.

Sincerely,

Becky Addington

Stephanie Kost

From: Becky Addington [bjbrooks03@earthlink.net]
Sent: Wednesday, October 13, 2004 5:29 PM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Do Not Destroy Cable Variety

Becky Addington
511 Glyn Ellen Dr.
Union City, Indiana 47390

October 13, 2004

Kevin J Martin
,

Dear Kevin Martin:

I have been informed that there are discussions under way to change cable service to a "pay per channel" system.

I am writing to urge you, in the strongest possible way, to oppose this move.

Pay per channel will severely diminish the variety of channel options that I currently have through cable, and will not save me any money. In fact, with the additional fees and equipment needs, it could end up costing me more.

While I understand the good intentions that are behind this, in order to give the consumer more control over what they view, this move will not only reduce the viewing options, but it will also destroy smaller channels and religious broadcasters.

A better way to ensure quality content on television is to enforce decency standards through fines and other regulatory actions.

Sincerely,

Becky Addington

Stephanie Kost

From: Ben Ferrell [ben@bmcadv.com]
Sent: Wednesday, October 13, 2004 3:45 PM
To: KAQuinn
Subject: Do Not Destroy Cable Variety

Ben Ferrell
President
BMC Advertising
2419 E. Skelly Drive
Tulsa, OK 74105

October 13, 2004

Kathleen Q Abernathy

Dear Kathleen Abernathy:

I have been informed that there are discussions under way to change cable service to a "pay per channel" system.

I am writing to urge you, in the strongest possible way, to oppose this move.

Pay per channel will severely diminish the variety of channel options that I currently have through cable, and will not save me any money. In fact, with the additional fees and equipment needs, it could end up costing me more.

While I understand the good intentions that are behind this, in order to give the consumer more control over what they view, this move will not only reduce the viewing options, but it will also destroy smaller channels and religious broadcasters.

A better way to ensure quality content on television is to enforce decency standards through fines and other regulatory actions.

Sincerely,

Ben Ferrell
918-743-4600
President
BMC Advertising

Stephanie Kost

From: Anthony Dennis [tonydennis@comcast.net]
Sent: Tuesday, October 19, 2004 7:15 AM
To: KAQuinn
Subject: Do Not Destroy Cable Variety

Anthony Dennis
475 Madison Ave
Warminster, PA 18974

October 19, 2004

Kathleen Q Abernathy

Dear Kathleen Abernathy:

I have been informed that there are discussions under way to change cable service to a "pay per channel" system.

I am writing to urge you, in the strongest possible way, to oppose this move.

Pay per channel will severely diminish the variety of channel options that I currently have through cable, and will not save me any money. In fact, with the additional fees and equipment needs, it could end up costing me more.

While I understand the good intentions that are behind this, in order to give the consumer more control over what they view, this move will not only reduce the viewing options, but it will also destroy smaller channels and religious broadcasters.

A better way to ensure quality content on television is to enforce decency standards through fines and other regulatory actions.

Sincerely,

Mr. Anthony L. Dennis
215-442-0998

Stephanie Kost

From: Anthony Dennis [tonydennis@comcast.net]
Sent: Tuesday, October 19, 2004 7:15 AM
To: Michael Powell
Subject: Do Not Destroy Cable Variety

Anthony Dennis
475 Madison Ave
Warminster, PA 18974

October 19, 2004

Michael K Powell
,

Dear Michael Powell:

I have been informed that there are discussions under way to change cable service to a "pay per channel" system.

I am writing to urge you, in the strongest possible way, to oppose this move.

Pay per channel will severely diminish the variety of channel options that I currently have through cable, and will not save me any money. In fact, with the additional fees and equipment needs, it could end up costing me more.

While I understand the good intentions that are behind this, in order to give the consumer more control over what they view, this move will not only reduce the viewing options, but it will also destroy smaller channels and religious broadcasters.

A better way to ensure quality content on television is to enforce decency standards through fines and other regulatory actions.

Sincerely,

Mr. Anthony L. Dennis
215-442-0998

Stephanie Kost

From: Anthony Dennis [tonydennis@comcast.net]
Sent: Tuesday, October 19, 2004 7:15 AM
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Subject: Do Not Destroy Cable Variety

Anthony Dennis
475 Madison Ave
Warminster, PA 18974

October 19, 2004

Jonathan S Adelstein

Dear Jonathan Adelstein:

I have been informed that there are discussions under way to change cable service to a "pay per channel" system.

I am writing to urge you, in the strongest possible way, to oppose this move.

Pay per channel will severely diminish the variety of channel options that I currently have through cable, and will not save me any money. In fact, with the additional fees and equipment needs, it could end up costing me more.

While I understand the good intentions that are behind this, in order to give the consumer more control over what they view, this move will not only reduce the viewing options, but it will also destroy smaller channels and religious broadcasters.

A better way to ensure quality content on television is to enforce decency standards through fines and other regulatory actions.

Sincerely,

Mr. Anthony L. Dennis
215-442-0998

Stephanie Kost

From: April Bernal [aprile_b@excite.com]
Sent: Friday, October 15, 2004 7:07 AM
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Subject: No on "A La Carte" Cable

April Bernal
136 woodland dr
vista, ca 92083

October 15, 2004

Jonathan S Adelstein

Dear Jonathan Adelstein:

I have been informed that there are discussions under way to change cable service to a "pay per channel" system.

I am writing to urge you, in the strongest possible way, to oppose this move.

Pay per channel will severely diminish the variety of channel options that I currently have through cable, and will not save me any money. In fact, with the additional fees and equipment needs, it could end up costing me more.

While I understand the good intentions that are behind this, in order to give the consumer more control over what they view, this move will not only reduce the viewing options, but it will also destroy smaller channels and religious broadcasters.

A better way to ensure quality content on television is to enforce decency standards through fines and other regulatory actions.

Sincerely,

April Bernal
760-586-1497

Stephanie Kost

From: Cheryl Harbour [auntcher@cfaith.com]
Sent: Sunday, October 17, 2004 9:05 PM
To: Michael Powell
Subject: Stop "Pay Per Channel" Plans

Cheryl Harbour
17 Smoke Tree Drive
Fenton, MO 63026

October 17, 2004

Michael K Powell

Dear Michael Powell:

I have been informed that there are discussions under way to change cable service to a "pay per channel" system.

I am writing to urge you, in the strongest possible way, to oppose this move.

Pay per channel will severely diminish the variety of channel options that I currently have through cable, and will not save me any money. In fact, with the additional fees and equipment needs, it could end up costing me more.

While I understand the good intentions that are behind this, in order to give the consumer more control over what they view, this move will not only reduce the viewing options, but it will also destroy smaller channels and religious broadcasters.

A better way to ensure quality content on television is to enforce decency standards through fines and other regulatory actions.

Sincerely,

Cheryl M Harbour

Stephanie Kost

From: Cheryl Harbour [auntcher@cfaith.com]
Sent: Sunday, October 17, 2004 9:05 PM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Stop "Pay Per Channel" Plans

Cheryl Harbour
17 Smoke Tree Drive
Fenton, MO 63026

October 17, 2004

Kevin J Martin

Dear Kevin Martin:

I have been informed that there are discussions under way to change cable service to a "pay per channel" system.

I am writing to urge you, in the strongest possible way, to oppose this move.

Pay per channel will severely diminish the variety of channel options that I currently have through cable, and will not save me any money. In fact, with the additional fees and equipment needs, it could end up costing me more.

While I understand the good intentions that are behind this, in order to give the consumer more control over what they view, this move will not only reduce the viewing options, but it will also destroy smaller channels and religious broadcasters.

A better way to ensure quality content on television is to enforce decency standards through fines and other regulatory actions.

Sincerely,

Cheryl M Harbour

Stephanie Kost

From: Cheryl Perez [jazziita@bbtel.com]
Sent: Friday, October 15, 2004 9:29 PM
To: Michael Copps
Subject: Stop "Pay Per Channel" Plans

Cheryl Perez
817 McCullum Ave
Elizabethtown, Kentucky 42701

October 15, 2004

Michael J Copps

Dear Michael Copps:

I have been informed that there are discussions under way to change cable service to a "pay per channel" system.

I am writing to urge you, in the strongest possible way, to oppose this move.

Pay per channel will severely diminish the variety of channel options that I currently have through cable, and will not save me any money. In fact, with the additional fees and equipment needs, it could end up costing me more.

While I understand the good intentions that are behind this, in order to give the consumer more control over what they view, this move will not only reduce the viewing options, but it will also destroy smaller channels and religious broadcasters.

A better way to ensure quality content on television is to enforce decency standards through fines and other regulatory actions.

Sincerely,

Cheryl A. Perez
(270)766-9408

Stephanie Kost

From: Cheryl Perez [jazzitta@bbtel.com]
Sent: Friday, October 15, 2004 9:30 PM
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Subject: Stop "Pay Per Channel" Plans

Cheryl Perez
817 McCullum Ave
Elizabethtown, Kentucky 42701

October 15, 2004

Jonathan S Adelstein

Dear Jonathan Adelstein:

I have been informed that there are discussions under way to change cable service to a "pay per channel" system.

I am writing to urge you, in the strongest possible way, to oppose this move.

Pay per channel will severely diminish the variety of channel options that I currently have through cable, and will not save me any money. In fact, with the additional fees and equipment needs, it could end up costing me more.

While I understand the good intentions that are behind this, in order to give the consumer more control over what they view, this move will not only reduce the viewing options, but it will also destroy smaller channels and religious broadcasters.

A better way to ensure quality content on television is to enforce decency standards through fines and other regulatory actions.

Sincerely,

Cheryl A. Perez
(270)766-9408

Stephanie Kost

From: Cheryl Perez [jazzitta@bbtel.com]
Sent: Friday, October 15, 2004 9:29 PM
To: KAQuinn
Subject: Stop "Pay Per Channel" Plans

Cheryl Perez
817 McCullum Ave
Elizabethtown, Kentucky 42701

October 15, 2004

Kathleen Q Abernathy
,

Dear Kathleen Abernathy:

I have been informed that there are discussions under way to change cable service to a "pay per channel" system.

I am writing to urge you, in the strongest possible way, to oppose this move.

Pay per channel will severely diminish the variety of channel options that I currently have through cable, and will not save me any money. In fact, with the additional fees and equipment needs, it could end up costing me more.

While I understand the good intentions that are behind this, in order to give the consumer more control over what they view, this move will not only reduce the viewing options, but it will also destroy smaller channels and religious broadcasters.

A better way to ensure quality content on television is to enforce decency standards through fines and other regulatory actions.

Sincerely,

Cheryl A. Perez
(270)766-9408

Stephanie Kost

From: Cheryl Perez [jazzitta@bbtel.com]
Sent: Friday, October 15, 2004 9:29 PM
To: Michael Powell
Subject: Stop "Pay Per Channel" Plans

Cheryl Perez
817 McCullum Ave
Elizabethtown, Kentucky 42701

October 15, 2004

Michael K Powell
,

Dear Michael Powell:

I have been informed that there are discussions under way to change cable service to a "pay per channel" system.

I am writing to urge you, in the strongest possible way, to oppose this move.

Pay per channel will severely diminish the variety of channel options that I currently have through cable, and will not save me any money. In fact, with the additional fees and equipment needs, it could end up costing me more.

While I understand the good intentions that are behind this, in order to give the consumer more control over what they view, this move will not only reduce the viewing options, but it will also destroy smaller channels and religious broadcasters.

A better way to ensure quality content on television is to enforce decency standards through fines and other regulatory actions.

Sincerely,

Cheryl A. Perez
(270)766-9408

Stephanie Kost

From: Cheryl Perez [jazzitta@bbtel.com]
Sent: Friday, October 15, 2004 9:29 PM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Stop "Pay Per Channel" Plans

Cheryl Perez
817 McCullum Ave
Elizabethtown, Kentucky 42701

October 15, 2004

Kevin J Martin

Dear Kevin Martin:

I have been informed that there are discussions under way to change cable service to a "pay per channel" system.

I am writing to urge you, in the strongest possible way, to oppose this move.

Pay per channel will severely diminish the variety of channel options that I currently have through cable, and will not save me any money. In fact, with the additional fees and equipment needs, it could end up costing me more.

While I understand the good intentions that are behind this, in order to give the consumer more control over what they view, this move will not only reduce the viewing options, but it will also destroy smaller channels and religious broadcasters.

A better way to ensure quality content on television is to enforce decency standards through fines and other regulatory actions.

Sincerely,

Cheryl A. Perez
(270)766-9408

Stephanie Kost

From: Cheryl Smith [phd@glwb.net]
Sent: Wednesday, October 20, 2004 6:51 AM
To: Michael Powell
Subject: Do Not Destroy Cable Variety

Cheryl Smith
15345 Chamberlain road
Grafton, Ohio 44044

October 20, 2004

Michael K Powell

Dear Michael Powell:

I have been informed that there are discussions under way to change cable service to a "pay per channel" system.

I am writing to urge you, in the strongest possible way, to oppose this move.

Pay per channel will severely diminish the variety of channel options that I currently have through cable, and will not save consumers any money. In fact, with the additional fees and equipment needs, it could end up costing consumers more.

While I understand the good intentions that are behind this, in order to give the consumer more control over what they view, this move will not only reduce the viewing options, but it will also destroy smaller channels and religious broadcasters.

A better way to ensure quality content on television is to enforce decency standards through fines and other regulatory actions.

Sincerely,

Cheryl Smith
449-309-6706

Stephanie Kost

From: Cheryle Pritchett [cpritchett@calhouninsurance.com]
Sent: Tuesday, October 19, 2004 5:44 PM
To: KAQuinn
Subject: No on "A La Carte" Cable

Cheryle Pritchett
President
Calhoun Insurance
8 N. Main Street
Farmington, MO 63640

October 19, 2004

Kathleen Q Abernathy

Dear Kathleen Abernathy:

I have been informed that there are discussions under way to change cable service to a "pay per channel" system.

I am writing to urge you, in the strongest possible way, to oppose this move.

Pay per channel will severely diminish the variety of channel options that I currently have through cable, and will not save me any money. In fact, with the additional fees and equipment needs, it could end up costing me more.

While I understand the good intentions that are behind this, in order to give the consumer more control over what they view, this move will not only reduce the viewing options, but it will also destroy smaller channels and religious broadcasters.

A better way to ensure quality content on television is to enforce decency standards through fines and other regulatory actions.

Sincerely,

Cheryle Pritchett
573-756-3789
President
Calhoun Insurance

Stephanie Kost

From: Cheryle Pritchett [cpritchett@calhouninsurance.com]
Sent: Tuesday, October 19, 2004 5:44 PM
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Subject: No on "A La Carte" Cable

Cheryle Pritchett
President
Calhoun Insurance
8 N. Main Street
Farmington, MO 63640

October 19, 2004

Jonathan S Adelstein

Dear Jonathan Adelstein:

I have been informed that there are discussions under way to change cable service to a "pay per channel" system.

I am writing to urge you, in the strongest possible way, to oppose this move.

Pay per channel will severely diminish the variety of channel options that I currently have through cable, and will not save me any money. In fact, with the additional fees and equipment needs, it could end up costing me more.

While I understand the good intentions that are behind this, in order to give the consumer more control over what they view, this move will not only reduce the viewing options, but it will also destroy smaller channels and religious broadcasters.

A better way to ensure quality content on television is to enforce decency standards through fines and other regulatory actions.

Sincerely,

Cheryle Pritchett
573-756-3789
President
Calhoun Insurance

Stephanie Kost

From: Cheryl Barnes [blessedlife@comcast.net]
Sent: Thursday, October 14, 2004 3:30 PM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: No on "A La Carte" Cable

Cheryl Barnes
20 Harbour Lane
Richmond Hill, GA 31324

October 14, 2004

Kevin J Martin

Dear Kevin Martin:

I have been informed that there are discussions under way to change cable service to a "pay per channel" system.

I am writing to urge you, in the strongest possible way, to oppose this move.

Pay per channel will severely diminish the variety of channel options that I currently have through cable, and will not save me any money. In fact, with the additional fees and equipment needs, it could end up costing me more.

While I understand the good intentions that are behind this, in order to give the consumer more control over what they view, this move will not only reduce the viewing options, but it will also destroy smaller channels and religious broadcasters.

A better way to ensure quality content on television is to enforce decency standards through fines and other regulatory actions.

Sincerely,

Cheryl Barnes

Stephanie Kost

From: Cheryl Barnes [blessedlife@comcast.net]
Sent: Thursday, October 14, 2004 3:30 PM
To: Michael Powell
Subject: No on "A La Carte" Cable

Cheryl Barnes
20 Harbour Lane
Richmond Hill, GA 31324

October 14, 2004

Michael K Powell

Dear Michael Powell:

I have been informed that there are discussions under way to change cable service to a "pay per channel" system.

I am writing to urge you, in the strongest possible way, to oppose this move.

Pay per channel will severely diminish the variety of channel options that I currently have through cable, and will not save me any money. In fact, with the additional fees and equipment needs, it could end up costing me more.

While I understand the good intentions that are behind this, in order to give the consumer more control over what they view, this move will not only reduce the viewing options, but it will also destroy smaller channels and religious broadcasters.

A better way to ensure quality content on television is to enforce decency standards through fines and other regulatory actions.

Sincerely,

Cheryl Barnes

Stephanie Kost

From: Cheryl Barnes [blessedlife@comcast.net]
Sent: Thursday, October 14, 2004 3:30 PM
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Subject: No on "A La Carte" Cable

Cheryl Barnes
20 Harbour Lane
Richmond Hill, GA 31324

October 14, 2004

Jonathan S Adelstein
,

Dear Jonathan Adelstein:

I have been informed that there are discussions under way to change cable service to a "pay per channel" system.

I am writing to urge you, in the strongest possible way, to oppose this move.

Pay per channel will severely diminish the variety of channel options that I currently have through cable, and will not save me any money. In fact, with the additional fees and equipment needs, it could end up costing me more.

While I understand the good intentions that are behind this, in order to give the consumer more control over what they view, this move will not only reduce the viewing options, but it will also destroy smaller channels and religious broadcasters.

A better way to ensure quality content on television is to enforce decency standards through fines and other regulatory actions.

Sincerely,

Cheryl Barnes

Stephanie Kost

From: Cheryl Barnes [blessedlife@comcast.net]
Sent: Thursday, October 14, 2004 3:30 PM
To: Michael Copps
Subject: No on "A La Carte" Cable

Cheryl Barnes
20 Harbour Lane
Richmond Hill, GA 31324

October 14, 2004

Michael J Copps

Dear Michael Copps:

I have been informed that there are discussions under way to change cable service to a "pay per channel" system.

I am writing to urge you, in the strongest possible way, to oppose this move.

Pay per channel will severely diminish the variety of channel options that I currently have through cable, and will not save me any money. In fact, with the additional fees and equipment needs, it could end up costing me more.

While I understand the good intentions that are behind this, in order to give the consumer more control over what they view, this move will not only reduce the viewing options, but it will also destroy smaller channels and religious broadcasters.

A better way to ensure quality content on television is to enforce decency standards through fines and other regulatory actions.

Sincerely,

Cheryl Barnes

Stephanie Kost

From: Cheryl Harbour [auntcher@cfaith.com]
Sent: Sunday, October 17, 2004 9:05 PM
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Subject: Stop "Pay Per Channel" Plans

Cheryl Harbour
17 Smoke Tree Drive
Fenton, MO 63026

October 17, 2004

Jonathan S Adelstein
,

Dear Jonathan Adelstein:

I have been informed that there are discussions under way to change cable service to a "pay per channel" system.

I am writing to urge you, in the strongest possible way, to oppose this move.

Pay per channel will severely diminish the variety of channel options that I currently have through cable, and will not save me any money. In fact, with the additional fees and equipment needs, it could end up costing me more.

While I understand the good intentions that are behind this, in order to give the consumer more control over what they view, this move will not only reduce the viewing options, but it will also destroy smaller channels and religious broadcasters.

A better way to ensure quality content on television is to enforce decency standards through fines and other regulatory actions.

Sincerely,

Cheryl M Harbour

Stephanie Kost

From: Stephanie Kost
To: KAQuinn
Subject: Stop "Pay Per Channel" Plans

chad berliner
8884 pioneer rd.
larsen, wisconsin, wi 54947

October 19, 2004

Kathleen Q Abernathy

Dear Kathleen Abernathy:

I have been informed that there are discussions under way to change cable service to a "pay per channel" system.

I am writing to urge you, in the strongest possible way, to oppose this move.

Pay per channel will severely diminish the variety of channel options that I currently have through cable, and will not save me any money. In fact, with the additional fees and equipment needs, it could end up costing me more.

While I understand the good intentions that are behind this, in order to give the consumer more control over what they view, this move will not only reduce the viewing options, but it will also destroy smaller channels and religious broadcasters.

A better way to ensure quality content on television is to enforce decency standards through fines and other regulatory actions.

Sincerely,

chad berliner
92-420-5764